

Promotion/Tenure Criteria
Department of English

PROFESSORIAL RANKS

In all matters related to promotion and tenure, our department will follow and adhere to the *Guidelines for Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure* and will follow procedures laid out in the departmental Bylaws. The standards, criteria, and procedures that follow provide specific information on how our department will handle the promotion and tenure process, and on the criteria our faculty have approved for promotion and for tenure in the department. All faculty are expected to be familiar with both this document and the University Guidelines. Matters not addressed in this document can be answered by resort to the *Guidelines* or Bylaws, with the *Guidelines* taking precedence on any issue of discrepancy.

Advisement: When we appoint a new faculty member the head will give a copy of this document and will advise that individual in writing about their responsibilities in the areas of research, teaching, and/or service and about the department's requirements for promotion and tenure. The new faculty member will sign a letter indicating receipt and understanding of these guidelines.

For each assistant professor, the department head will appoint a senior faculty mentor who will also advise on matters of teaching, research, professional decorum, the department, and promotion and tenure. The appointment can be changed at any time by request of either party.

In the written annual evaluation, the department head will provide written advice to faculty below the rank of professor on their progress towards promotion, with specific suggestions as to what the faculty member must do in teaching, research, and service for promotion to the next rank and for tenure (if appropriate).

Third-year review: In the spring of the third year each assistant professor will submit a dossier equivalent to sections IV and V (Vita and Achievements) of the promotion dossier described in the *Guidelines*. The CV must follow the format described in the Administrative Guidelines on the Provost's web site, http://provost.uga.edu/index.php/policies/appointment-promotion-and-tenure/admin_guidelines. The department head or an assigned faculty mentor will advise the faculty member on the contents and preparation of the dossier.

At the same time, the department head will appoint a committee of three faculty (associate professors and/or professors) to review the candidate's dossier and performance. The candidate's mentor may serve as a member on the committee. The committee will review publications and works in progress, visit several classes, and read through evaluations and other evidence of performance in instruction. On the basis of this review, the committee will prepare a report that presents in detail its findings and, addressing in particular the question of whether the candidate is progressing in a satisfactory way towards meeting departmental criteria for promotion and tenure, will make clear recommendations to the candidate. If there are areas of concern, the committee shall state the perceived problems, suggest remedies, and lay out what evidence will be required in order for the candidate to meet departmental criteria. At least 16 days before the department meeting, this report will be given to the candidate who will have the option of responding within 14 days.

At a department meeting with a 2/3 quorum of eligible voting faculty in attendance, the committee will present the report and the candidate's response to the faculty. (The *Guidelines* and department Bylaws define faculty voting eligibility.) After discussion and possible amendment of the report, the faculty will vote (yes or no) on whether progress toward promotion and tenure is sufficient. The faculty, in a separate ballot, will also vote (yes or no) on whether the candidate's contract should be renewed for a fourth year.

The head will meet with the candidate and provide a copy of the (revised) committee report and a written statement of the departmental vote. The candidate may reply in writing to the report within 30 days. The report approved by the faculty and any response along with any summarizing statement by the head will be included eventually in the promotion and tenure dossier. The report and third-year vote lay out the department's expectations and advise the head on whether to continue the candidate's employment.

Tenure and Promotion

Preliminary Consideration: The department will follow procedures for initial consideration presented in the *Guidelines* and Bylaws. In the Spring of the appropriate year, by the deadline of February 1, candidates who wish to be considered for tenure and/or promotion will communicate this intention in writing to the department head. [Note: Here and below, a date falling on a weekend or holiday is replaced by the closest following work day.] The head will appoint a committee of eligible faculty to assess the candidate's accomplishments and prepare a report for the faculty based on review of publications, class visits, teaching evaluations, and any other materials presented. The criteria used in assessment of the candidate are subject to

any consideration specified in the Letter of Offer and any other agreements made between the candidate and the department/university at the time of hire.

The candidate will by March 1 present a vita, copies of publications, and statement of achievements to the department. All faculty eligible to vote on the candidate will have access to all materials presented by the candidate. The committee will present its report to the voting faculty at a meeting held by April 15. The faculty will vote (yes/no) on whether the candidate should go forward with the review process (seeking outside letters of evaluation, preparing the dossier).

The head will convey the results in writing to the candidate within three working days of the vote. In accordance with the *Guidelines*, candidates who receive a majority of “yes” votes and who still wish to be reviewed formally for promotion (and tenure, if appropriate) will work with the department head or an appointed senior mentor to prepare the dossier.

Formal Review: In all matters pertaining to the formal review, the department will follow the *Guidelines* and Bylaws.

The candidate will make available by August 15 copies of all publications as well as teaching materials, including student evaluations, syllabi, and other evidence pertaining to teaching. Student letters may be submitted if solicited by the department head from a list made available by the candidate. All evaluations for all courses taught must be submitted to the head. Articles or books that have been accepted but not published may be submitted if accompanied by a letter of formal acceptance and by readers’ reports (if available). All of the materials prepared for the dossier, including copies of all published items listed on the vita and all of the external letters of assessment, must be made available to the faculty on this same date of August 15.

The faculty eligible to vote will meet by September 1 to discuss the candidate’s credentials and vote whether to recommend tenure and/or promotion.

Requests for reconsideration by candidates who do not receive a positive recommendation must be handled in accordance with the *Guidelines*.

Criteria for the Professorial Ranks (for all the related disciplines composing the Department of English)

For Tenure and for Promotion to Associate Professor:

For tenure and for promotion to associate professor, candidates demonstrate both skill in teaching and a developing national reputation as authorities in their particular fields.

Teaching: On the basis of peer reviews, awards, students evaluations, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, the candidate must show evidence of excellence as a teacher in the classroom and any other pertinent forms of instruction, including student advisement, direction of graduate or undergraduate research, independent studies, internships, or online or service learning. Any concerns about the candidate's teaching raised at the first-year review or subsequently should be addressed by the candidate. As the Dean's Office requires, "Candidates whose record reflects difficulty in teaching must demonstrate that problems have been addressed and improvement has occurred by the time of Promotion and Tenure."

Research: Whatever the specific discipline, the successful candidate for promotion and tenure must present a body of original research or creative work which demonstrates substantive, original, innovative intellectual contributions in the candidate's field and which has been appropriately published or otherwise disseminated through refereed and respected means. This work, as described below, must be of a quality and quantity sufficient to earn the candidate at least the beginnings of a national reputation in the candidate's field. The candidate must also show evidence of and commitment to sustaining and developing an independent agenda and long-term trajectory for research or creative work.

Because the Department of English represents a diverse group of ever-changing fields, no single hierarchy of presses and journals can be specified, but the expectation is that publication will be through peer-reviewed venues (whether in print or on-line). Each candidate must include in the dossier a blurb for each press and journal outlining its standing in the candidate's discipline and describing its refereeing or selection process. The departmental expectation is that by the August 15 deadline, faculty who qualify for promotion to associate professor (and for tenure) should have, since the conferring of the candidate's terminal degree, a book published or scheduled for publication (contract and specific schedule in hand) by a reputable press together with evidence of other scholarly and intellectual activity.

We recognize that not all candidates will demonstrate their research achievements in the same way, and therefore, in exceptional cases, when in the judgment of the faculty a candidate has produced a substantial body of work, equivalent in significance to the more traditional scholarly

book, we will support the candidate's promotion. Acceptable alternative evidence of scholarly or creative activity might include work (published or scheduled for publication) such as the following: essays in journals or anthologies; editorial work in preparing scholarly editions, bibliographies, anthologies, or translations; co-authored works; digital tools; external funded grants of unusual significance. Reports of collaborative works must include a statement detailing the candidate's share of the effort. The work detailed here would naturally also provide further supporting evidence for any candidate with a single-authored book.

Evidence of national recognition for research might be demonstrated in the form of reviews and reprints of the candidate's work, citations, awards, conference presentations, external letters of assessment, service on editorial boards, requests to review articles and books either pre- or post-publication, invitations to contribute to edited collections or encyclopedias, to be a guest or plenary speaker, to give a reading, to participate in a panel, or to lead a workshop, as well as in manners not here named, but which also show that others regard the candidate as an accomplished scholar and authority to whom they can turn.

Since the type of scholarship engaged in by faculty in the English department cannot be usefully or readily quantified (for example one particularly strong article might involve as much scholarship as two or three slighter articles), the candidates will be responsible for explicating the significance of their work in their discipline. Outside letters and careful reading by the faculty presumably will assist in this assessment.

All candidates must provide evidence of the intellectual rigor and quality of their research endeavors and professional activities, but candidates in areas less traditional or less familiar to their colleagues may need to document further the value of their work, explaining, for example, the significance of a specific accomplishment or describing the intellectual process underlying a particular project.

If the department hires a faculty member whose research will result in different kinds of research productivity that are not included above, the department and the candidate must agree in writing at the time of appointment as to the general expectations that the candidate must satisfy; the Dean must approve this agreement.

Service: Successful candidates for promotion to associate professor and/or for tenure are expected to attend departmental meetings, have some limited service on student and departmental committees, and, if asked to serve, limited service on campus committees and governing bodies. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life

of the department, the discipline, the University and the community. Participation or leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

Administration: While candidates whose assignments include (or have included) time budgeted for administration can document achievements in this area as further evidence of productivity, such activity does not replace research requirements, and untenured faculty are discouraged from taking time from teaching and research for administration.

For Promotion to Professor:

For promotion to full professor, candidates must demonstrate that their work is of a high level and is well regarded by professional colleagues nationally or internationally, and that they are likely to continue producing high-quality research.

Teaching: On the basis of peer reviews, awards, students evaluations, participation in departmental and/or college or university activities related to teaching, the candidate must show evidence of excellence as a teacher in the classroom and any other pertinent forms of instruction, including student advisement, direction of graduate or undergraduate research, independent studies, internships, or online or service learning.

Research: Whatever the specific discipline, the successful candidate for promotion to professor must present a body of original research or creative work which demonstrates substantive, original, innovative intellectual contributions in the candidate's field and which has been appropriately published or otherwise disseminated since the candidate's last promotion through refereed and respected means. This work, as described below, must be of a quality and quantity sufficient to earn the candidate a national and/or international reputation, as appropriate to the candidate's field.

Because the Department of English represents a diverse group of ever-changing fields, no single hierarchy of presses and journals can be specified, but the expectation is that publication will be through peer-reviewed venues (whether in print or on-line). Each candidate must include in the dossier a blurb for each press and journal outlining its standing in the candidate's discipline and describing its refereeing or selection process. The departmental expectation is that by the August 15 deadline, faculty who qualify for promotion to professor should have a book in hand published since the candidate's last promotion or scheduled for publication (contract and specific schedule in hand) by a reputable press together with evidence of other scholarly and intellectual activity.

We recognize that not all candidates will demonstrate their research achievements in the same way, and therefore, in exceptional cases, when in the judgment of the faculty a candidate has produced a substantial body of work, equivalent in significance to the more traditional scholarly book, we will support the candidate's promotion. Acceptable alternative evidence of scholarly activity might include work (published or scheduled for publication) such as the following: essays in journals or anthologies; editorial work in preparing scholarly editions, bibliographies, anthologies, or translations; co-authored works; digital tools; external funded grants of unusual significance. Reports of collaborative works must include a statement detailing the candidate's share of the effort. The work detailed here would naturally also provide further supporting evidence for any candidate with a single-authored book.

Evidence of national or international recognition for research might be demonstrated in the form of reviews of the candidate's work, citations, awards, conference presentations, external letters of assessment, service on editorial boards, requests to review articles and books either pre- or post-publication, and invitations to contribute to edited collections or encyclopedias, to be a guest or plenary speaker, to give a reading, to participate in a panel, or to lead a workshop, as well as in manners not here named, but which also show that others regard the candidate as an accomplished scholar and authority to whom they can turn.

Since the type of scholarship engaged in by faculty in the English department cannot be usefully or readily quantified (for example one particularly strong article might involve as much scholarship as two or three slighter articles), the candidate will be responsible for explicating the significance of their work in their discipline. Outside letters and careful reading by the faculty presumably will assist in this assessment. Although significant external grants alone do not substitute for books or for articles, in conjunction with publications or other professional activities, they constitute clear evidence of productivity in research.

All candidates must provide evidence of the intellectual rigor and quality of their research endeavors and professional activities, but candidates in areas less traditional or less familiar to their colleagues may need to document further the value of their work, explaining, for example, the significance of a specific accomplishment or describing the intellectual process underlying a particular project.

Service: Successful candidates for promotion to professor will demonstrate active participation in the life of the department, the College, and the University by service on student, departmental, and/or college and university committees. They will show a record of participation in departmental activities, including attendance at meetings. Beyond the level of the kinds of service that involve instruction and research, service can be broadly interpreted to mean participation in activities that contribute to the life of the department, the discipline, the

University, and the community. Leadership in professional organizations does help meet these criteria.

Administration: Candidates whose assignments include (or have included) time budgeted for administration can document achievements in this area as further evidence of productivity.

ACADEMIC PROFESSIONALS AND LECTURERS

In all matters related to promotion of academic professionals and lecturers, our department will follow and adhere to the University guidelines found in the UGA Academic Affairs Policy Manual and the Board of Regents Policy Manual and will follow procedures laid out in the departmental Bylaws. The guidelines and criteria that follow provide specific information on how our department will handle promotion, and on the criteria our faculty have approved for promotion in the department. Issues not addressed in this document can be answered by resort to the guidelines or Bylaws, with the guidelines taking precedence.

Advisement: When we appoint a new lecturer or academic professional, the head will give a copy of this document and will advise that individual in writing about their responsibilities in the areas of research, teaching, and/or service and about the department's requirements for promotion. The new faculty member will sign a letter indicating receipt and understanding of these guidelines.

For each new academic professional or lecturer, the department head will appoint a senior faculty mentor, preferably another academic professional or lecturer as appropriate, who will also advise on matters of teaching, research, professional decorum, the department, and promotion. The appointment can be changed at any time by request of either party.

In the written annual evaluation, the department head will provide written advice to faculty below the rank of Senior Academic Professional or Senior Lecturer on their progress towards promotion, with specific suggestions as to what the faculty member must do in teaching, research, and service for promotion to the next rank.

Academic Professionals: The three ranks in ascending order are Academic Professional Associate, Academic Professional, and Senior Academic Professional. Academic Professional

Associates are eligible for promotion after 5 years in rank; Academic Professionals are eligible after 4 years in rank.

In the Spring of the appropriate year (for example, the Spring of the fourth year in rank of a candidate wishing to go up for promotion after five years in rank), by the deadline of February 1, candidates who wish to be considered for promotion will communicate this intention in writing to the department head. [Note: Here and below, a date falling on a weekend or holiday is replaced by the closest following work day.] The head will appoint a committee of eligible faculty (3 including tenured faculty and academic professionals at or above the level being considered) to assess the candidate's accomplishments and prepare a report for the faculty based on review of the candidate's dossier, class visits, teaching evaluations, and any other materials presented. The head will solicit letters of evaluation from at least 4 professional contacts whose names are provided by the candidate and who can appraise the candidate's qualifications.

The candidate will by March 1 present to the department a vita and dossier detailing achievements. All faculty eligible to vote on the candidate will have access to all materials presented by the candidate. The committee will present its report to the voting faculty (a 2/3 quorum of all faculty in the three professorial ranks, academic professionals at or above the rank being considered, and Senior Lecturers) at a meeting held by April 15. The faculty will vote (yes/no) on whether to recommend promotion.

The head will convey the results in writing to the candidate within three working days of the vote. Candidates who receive a majority of "yes" votes and who still wish to be reviewed formally for promotion will work with the department head or an appointed senior mentor to prepare the dossier.

Criteria: Because academic professionals are responsible for very varied assignments, no single set of criteria can be specified; no matter the candidate's assignment and scholarly discipline, the candidate must demonstrate exceptional performance of both administrative and teaching duties. Successful candidates will have developed a reputation in the department and/or university for their administrative services such that they are valued for their expertise and as resources to whom other faculty can turn. As stated in the guidelines, promotion to Academic Professional requires that "the quality of performance and potential for development must be recognized by peers." Promotion to Senior Academic Professional requires "evidence of superior performance and recognition by peers (whether national, regional, or local as appropriate for the position)."

Academic professionals are not generally budgeted for research or service and, therefore, unless otherwise specified, such activities are not required for promotion. Nonetheless, evidence of scholarly activity and service contributions at the departmental, college/university, or professional level may be included in the dossier to help demonstrate the candidate's extraordinary value to the university. Given the range of variability in appointments where academic professionals are budgeted for research or service, the department and the candidate must agree in writing at the time of appointment as to the general expectations that the candidate must satisfy; the Dean must approve this agreement. Candidates must provide in their dossiers evidence of their accomplishments in research or service commensurate with the expectations laid out at the time of their appointment.

Lecturers: The two ranks are Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. Reappointment to the position of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer is made on an annual basis. However, in the sixth year a Lecturer or Senior Lecturer must undergo a more thorough review for either reappointment or promotion. Time in rank is not in itself sufficient to earn promotion. As the University guidelines state, a successful candidate for promotion must demonstrate "exceptional teaching ability and extraordinary value to the university."

In the Spring of the fifth year, by the deadline of February 1, candidates who wish to be considered for reappointment or promotion will communicate this intention in writing to the department head. [Note: Here and below, a date falling on a weekend or holiday is replaced by the closest following work day.] The head will appoint a committee of eligible faculty (3 including tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers) to assess the candidate's accomplishments and prepare a report for the faculty based on review of the candidate's dossier, teaching portfolio, class visits, teaching evaluations, and any other materials presented.

The candidate will by March 1 present to the department a vita and dossier detailing achievements. All faculty eligible to vote on the candidate will have access to all materials presented by the candidate. The committee will present its report to the voting faculty (a 2/3 quorum of all faculty in the three professorial ranks, Senior Lecturers, and academic professionals who have been promoted at least once in the department) at a meeting held by April 15. The faculty will vote (yes/no) on whether to recommend reappointment or promotion.

The head will convey the results in writing to the candidate within three working days of the vote. Candidates who receive a majority of "yes" votes and who still wish to be reviewed formally for reappointment or promotion will work with the department head or an appointed

senior mentor to prepare the dossier. Advised by the committee report and department vote, a head may choose to reappoint as Lecturer a candidate who has been turned down for promotion.

Whether or not one seeks promotion in the sixth year, the sixth-year review is a one-time event. After the sixth year both Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are still reappointed on an annual basis, but they are not scheduled for any other extensive reviews. A Lecturer who chose not to try for promotion or who failed to achieve it in the sixth year may ask to be considered for promotion in any subsequent year.

Criteria: The department expects that Lecturers who aspire to promotion demonstrate excellence in classroom instruction and extraordinary value to the department and university. The dossier submitted for departmental review should provide a position description, vita, statement of teaching philosophy, and summary of accomplishments. A teaching portfolio should be submitted that provides evidence of exceptional teaching ability. Such documentation of instructional excellence may include, but is not limited to, the following: student or peer evaluations; course materials, such as syllabi, exams, student papers, etc.; teaching awards or recognition; evidence of scholarship in teaching; participation in faculty development programs or workshops related to instruction; development of new courses, instructional materials, or technological innovations; comments from peer collaborators; comments from student interviews; letters of commendation from students, faculty peers, or external colleagues.

Lecturers are not generally budgeted for research or service and, therefore, unless otherwise specified, such activities are not required for promotion. Nonetheless, evidence of scholarly activity and service contributions at the departmental, college/university, or professional level may be included in the dossier to help demonstrate the candidate's extraordinary value to the university. Given the range of variability in appointments where lecturers are budgeted for research or service, the department and the candidate must agree in writing at the time of appointment as to the general expectations that the candidate must satisfy; the Dean must approve this agreement. Candidates must provide in their dossiers evidence of their accomplishments in research or service commensurate with the expectations laid out at the time of their appointment.

REVISIONS TO PROMOTION/TENURE CRITERIA

This document and discipline-specific criteria must be accepted by the faculty within the Department of English, and must be reviewed and approved by the dean of the College and the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. New faculty members must be provided with this PTU document and University Guidelines. In addition, any changes or updates to this PTU document must be approved by the faculty, dean and the Provost. All revisions and approval dates must be listed in the PTU document.

Edited April 13, 2015

Approved by the University, June 8, 2015